National Evaluation of the

Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T) Program

2008 Report to Schools and Communities:

Anti-Social Norms among a Sample of Middle-School Students

by

Finn-Aage Esbensen, Ph.D.

Dana Peterson, Ph.D.

Terrance J. Taylor, Ph.D.

Vanessa R. Panfil

Bradley T. Brick, M.A.

This research was made possible, in part, by the support and participation of seven school districts, including the School District of Philadelphia. This project was supported by Award No. 2006-JV-FX-0011 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. We would also like to thank the numerous school administrators, teachers, students, and law enforcement officers for their involvement and assistance in this study. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice or of the seven participating school districts.

For questions about this report or for more information about the evaluation, please contact:

G.R.E.A.T. Evaluation
Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499
Phone: (314) 516-4777
Fax: (314) 516-5048

We would like to thank the numerous project staff for their work on this study:

Adrienne Freng, Ph.D.

Greeley Site Coordinator

Research Assistants

Jared Armstrong
Elizabeth Atwood
Adam Baggett
Brad Brick
Dena Carson
Desiree Coleman
Kelly Cutler
Steven Downing
Erin Flannery
Teri Gulledge
Laura Hastings
Sara Hoover
Joelle Jones
Russell Jewell
Graham Jones
Krystle Leugoud
Nicole Logan
Kristyn McCord
Meredith McKinney
Chris Melde
Nick Miofski
Adrian Molina
Vanessa Panfil
Skyler Pimple
Katie Polzer
Zachary Robbins
Aaron Sego
Brad Stevens
Candice Tate
Mia Taylor
Karin Tusinski
Ben Voss
Sarah Young

The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program

The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program is a gang and delinquency prevention program delivered by law enforcement officers within a school setting. Developed as a local program in 1991 by Phoenix-area law enforcement agencies, the program quickly spread throughout the United States. The original G.R.E.A.T. program operated as a nine-lesson lecture-based curriculum taught primarily in middle-school settings. Results from an earlier National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program (1995-2001) found no differences between G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. youths in terms of behavioral characteristics (i.e., gang membership and involvement in delinquent behavior).

Based in part on these findings, the G.R.E.A.T. program underwent a critical review that resulted in substantial program modifications. The revised curriculum (see box at right) consists of 13 lessons aimed at teaching youths the life-skills (e.g., communication and refusal skills, as well as conflict resolution and anger management techniques) thought necessary to prevent involvement in gang behavior and

The G.R.E.A.T. Lessons

1. **Welcome to G.R.E.A.T.** – An introductory lesson designed to provide students with basic knowledge about the connection between gangs, violence, drug abuse, and crime
2. **What's the Real Deal?** – Designed to help students learn ways to analyze information sources and develop realistic beliefs about gangs and violence
3. **It's About Us** – A lesson to help students learn about their communities (e.g., family, school, residential area) and their responsibilities
4. **Where Do We Go From Here?** – Designed to help students learn ways of developing realistic and achievable goals
5. **Decisions, Decisions, Decisions** – A lesson to help students develop decision-making skills
6. **Do You Hear What I Am Saying?** – Designed to help students develop effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills
7. **Walk in Someone Else's Shoes** – A lesson to help students develop active listening and empathy skills, with a particular emphasis on understanding victims of crime and violence
8. **Say It Like You Mean It** – Designed to help students develop effective refusal skills
9. **Getting Along Without Going Along** – A lesson to reinforce and practice the refusal skills learned in Lesson 8
10. **Keeping Your Cool** – A lesson to help students understand signs of anger and ways to manage the emotion
11. **Keeping It Together** – Designed to help students use the anger skills learned in Lesson 10 and apply them to interpersonal situations where conflicts and violence are possible
12. **Working It Out** – A lesson to help students develop effective conflict resolution techniques
13. **Looking Back** – Designed to conclude the G.R.E.A.T. program with an emphasis on the importance of conflict resolution skills as a way to avoid gangs and violence; students also present their projects aimed at improving their schools

delinquency. The revised G.R.E.A.T. curriculum was piloted in 2001, with full-scale implementation occurring in 2003.

The program's two main goals are:

1. To help youths avoid gang membership, violence, and criminal activity.
2. To help youths develop a positive relationship with law enforcement.

The National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.

In 2006, following a competitive peer review process, the National Institute of Justice awarded the University of Missouri-St. Louis funding to conduct the National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program. The evaluation consists of a number of different components, including student surveys; classroom observations in both G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. classrooms; surveys of teachers, school administrators, and law enforcement officers; interviews with G.R.E.A.T. officers and G.R.E.A.T. supervisors; and observations of G.R.E.AT. Officer Training (G.O.T.) and G.R.E.A.T. Families sessions.

The current report provides information obtained from more than 3,800 students enrolled in 195 different classrooms in 31 schools in seven cities across the continental United States during the 2007-2008 school year. This report is the second in a series of annual reports intended to provide school personnel, law enforcement, and other interested community members with information about issues related to self-reported youth attitudes and behaviors in their schools and communities. With the exception of the sample demographic information, the data described herein are drawn from the one-year follow-up survey of students (i.e., assessments one year following G.R.E.A.T. program implementation), conducted during the 2007-08 school year, which asked students a variety of questions about their attitudes and behaviors associated with gangs and violence and their experience with and perceptions of police. The survey questions were drawn from a variety of empirical studies assessing key risk and protective factors associated with youth problem behaviors. **In this year's report, we focus upon youths' responses to a series of attitudinal questions that tap "anti-social norms."**

Site Selection

During the summer of 2006, efforts were made to identify cities for inclusion in the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. Site selection was based on three main criteria: 1) existence of an established G.R.E.A.T. program, 2) geographic and demographic diversity, and 3) evidence of gang activity. This site selection process was carried out in a series of steps. First, the research staff contacted the G.R.E.A.T. Regional Administrators[1] and Bureau of Justice Assistance[2] personnel to identify locales with institutionalized programs. Consideration was given to factors such as the length of time the program had been in operation, number of G.R.E.A.T.-trained officers, number of schools in which the program was offered, and the components of the G.R.E.A.T. program implemented.[3] Second, once this list of agencies was constructed, the research staff contacted representatives in these cities to obtain more information about the delivery of the G.R.E.A.T. program. Third, given the focus of the program, information about gang activity in these potential cities was obtained from the National Youth Gang Center. Ultimately, a list of seven cities varying in size, region, and level of gang activity were identified: Albuquerque, New Mexico; Chicago, Illinois; Greeley, Colorado; Nashville, Tennessee; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Portland, Oregon; and a Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW), Texas area location.

Once the cities were selected, the research staff worked with the primary local law enforcement agency and the school district in each city to secure their cooperation. Upon district approval, schools were identified for study participation, and principals were contacted. The goal of the school selection was to identify schools that, taken as a whole, would be representative of the districts. Once initial agreement to participate was obtained from the school administrator, more detailed discussions/meetings were held between school personnel, G.R.E.A.T. officers, and the research team. Whenever possible, face-to-face meetings were

[1] G.R.E.A.T. is a national program overseen by the G.R.E.A.T. National Policy Board (NPB). For administrative purposes, responsibilities for program oversight are held by (or "given to") agencies operating in different geographic regions: Northeast, Midwest, Southeast, Southwest, and West. Additionally, two federal partners—the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (BATF) and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)—are involved in program training and oversight.

[2] The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) oversees the allocation of federal funds and grant compliance associated with the G.R.E.A.T. program.

[3] In addition to the "core" middle school curriculum described in this report, three additional components are available for communities to adopt: an Elementary School component, a Summer component, and G.R.E.A.T. Families. Funders required the National Evaluation to assess both the middle school and Families components; thus, implementation of these components became part of the site selection criteria.

held, but in some instances final arrangements were made via telephone. School and police personnel were informed of the purpose of the evaluation, issues related to the random assignment of classrooms to the treatment or control condition (i.e., receive G.R.E.A.T./not receive G.R.E.A.T.), procedures to obtain active parental consent for students in these classrooms, scheduling G.R.E.A.T. program delivery, and other logistical issues associated with the study design.

Student Sample

To maintain the scientific rigor of the evaluation design, in each participating school, classrooms were randomly assigned to the treatment (i.e., G.R.E.A.T.) or control condition. All students in the selected classrooms were eligible to participate in the evaluation. The 195 participating classrooms had a total of 4,905 students enrolled at the beginning of the data collection process.

Federal law considers youth under the age of 18 to be a "special population" requiring additional safeguards in research. The consent of the youth's parent/guardian is required for the youth's participation in any research study. Parental consent generally takes one of two forms: 1) passive consent (i.e., parents must specify in writing that their child be excluded from participation) or 2) active consent (i.e., parents must specify in writing that their child be included in participation).

Active parental consent procedures were implemented in this evaluation. The research staff worked closely with the principals and classroom teachers during the consent process. Teachers distributed and collected "consent form packets." Each packet included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the evaluation and an informed consent form (explaining the risks and benefits of the students' participation) for parents/guardians to read, sign, and return to the teacher. When allowed by the districts, the research staff provided monetary compensation to the teachers directly for their assistance. In some instances, district regulations prohibited such compensation; in these cases, compensation was provided as a donation, made in honor of the teachers, to the school or district. Students were also given a small personal radio, calculator, or tote bag in exchange for returning a completed consent form. These rewards were provided to students regardless of whether the parent/guardian granted or withheld consent for the youth to

participate in the study. Overall, 89.1 percent of youths (N=4,372) returned a completed consent form, with 77.9 percent of parents/guardians (N=3,820) allowing their child's participation.

To date, students in all 31 schools have completed pre-test surveys (prior to implementation of the G.R.E.A.T. program) with a completion rate of 98.3 percent and post-test surveys (shortly after completion of the G.R.E.A.T. program) with a completion rate of 94.6 percent. Students in 29 of the 31 schools have also completed the first annual follow-up survey (one year after pre-test surveys were administered) with a completion rate of 83.8 percent. As discussed in more detail in Footnote 4, below, two additional schools in Chicago were added to the sample one year after the evaluation began in the other 29 schools; thus, students in those two new schools have completed pre- and post-tests, but they will not complete their first annual follow-up survey until the 2008-09 school year.

Student Sample Characteristics

Table 1 presents the demographic information of the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. sample for the entire group of youths, as well as separately by site, according to students' responses to the pre-test survey; thus, this table includes information for students in all 31 schools. The sample is evenly split between males and females; most (55%) youths reside with both biological parents; and the majority (88%) was born in the United States. The sample is racially/ethnically diverse, with Hispanic youths (37%), White youths (27%), and African-American (17%) youths accounting for 81 percent of the sample.

Approximately two-thirds of the youths (61%) were aged 11 or younger at the pre-test, representing the fact that 26 of the 31 schools delivered the G.R.E.A.T. program in 6th grade; three of the six Chicago schools and two of four schools in Albuquerque taught G.R.E.A.T. in 7th grade. Thus, the students in Chicago and Albuquerque were somewhat older than students in the other sites. Except in Chicago (in which Hispanics are over-represented and African Americans under-represented), the sample is similar to the demographic composition of the respective school districts.[4]

[4] This disproportionate representation in Chicago occurred despite efforts by the research team to recruit schools that would be representative overall of Chicago Public Schools. One of the five originally-selected schools, which was comprised of nearly 100 percent African American students, was unable to meet the requirements of the study and was dropped from the sample. Given time constraints (i.e., too late in the school year to select a comparable school and implement the program with fidelity), we were unable to replace the excluded school during 2006-2007. Thus, the resulting sample was largely Hispanic, while the district was largely African-American. To increase

Table 1: Sample Characteristics at Wave 1

	Full Sample N=3,820	ABQ N=591	POR N=486	DFW area N=614	GRE N=582	NSH N=590	PHL N=457	CHI N=500
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sex								
--Male	50	50	42	54	52	55	43	50
--Female	50	50	58	46	48	46	57	50
Race/Ethnicity								
--White	27	16	51	20	34	45	12	7
--African American	18	4	7	21	2	23	44	29
--Hispanic/Latino	37	49	13	46	50	17	20	56
--American Indian	4	10	4	2	5	1	4	1
--Asian	4	2	9	6	1	6	4	1
--Multi-Racial	8	14	13	5	4	4	12	2
--Other	4	5	3	1	5	5	5	2
Age								
--11 or younger	61	35	79	74	77	80	61	18
--12	29	43	20	25	22	19	35	44
--13 or older	10	23	1	2	2	<1	4	38
Mean	11.48	11.87	11.21	11.27	11.23	11.19	11.42	12.22
Living Arrangement								
--Both Biological Parents	55	52	58	60	58	60	38	57
--Single Parent	20	20	15	15	14	18	24	19
--1 Biological/1 Step-Parent	13	15	13	14	15	12	18	12
--1 Biological/1 Other Adult	7	7	8	7	7	7	11	7
--Other Relatives	3	6	5	3	4	2	8	3
--Other Living Arrangement	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	1
Resident Status								
--Born outside U.S.	12	10	9	13	11	15	11	15
--Born in U.S.	88	90	91	87	89	85	89	85

representativeness of the sample, the decision was made to add two primarily African-American schools to the evaluation in the 2007-2008 school year, even though this meant that these schools would be one year behind other schools in the evaluation.

In the sections that follow, we describe the extent to which students in our sample adhere to a number of "anti-social norms." In the year-one follow-up survey, students were asked about their likelihood of giving in to **peer pressure** to engage in deviance, their level of **commitment to negative** (i.e., deviant) **peers**, their use of justifications or "**neutralizations**" for deviant behavior, their adoption of values associated with the "**street code**," and their **likelihood of reporting** deviant behavior if they were to witness it. Although demographic information for students in the two Chicago schools added to the evaluation in 2007-08 was included in sample characteristics described in Table 1, these students' responses were not included in the following analyses because the year-one follow-up survey will not be administered to them until the 2008-2009 school year. Thus, the remaining analyses were conducted with responses from about 3,200 students in the seven cities. **It is also important to note that since the responses reported in the remainder of this report are from the first annual follow-up survey, students are one year older than the data reported in Table 1 (which is based on information given by students in the pre-test survey).**

Peer Pressure

We asked students seven questions about their likelihood of engaging in deviant behavior if their friends wanted them to do so. These questions are presented in the text box labeled "Peer Pressure." Students were asked to respond on a scale of 1 to 5 (not at all likely, a little likely, somewhat likely, likely, very likely) how likely it is that they would go along with their friends in each situation. Table 2 displays the proportion of students who responded "not at all likely" to each of the questions, first for the overall sample, then by age and by site.

Overall, the majority of students reported it was not at all likely that they would engage in any of the behaviors, although a lower proportion reported this response in regard to "bullying another student at school" (57%) and "cheating on a test at school" (54%) than the other potential

Peer Pressure

Still thinking about your current friends, how likely is it that you would go along with them if they wanted you to do the following things with them?

1. Bully another student at school?
2. Break into a home in your community?
3. Beat up a stranger on the street?
4. Cheat on a test at school?
5. Steal something from a store?
6. Drink alcohol?
7. Use illegal drugs?

Not at all likely, A little likely, Somewhat likely, Likely, Very likely

behaviors. Very few youths reported that it was "likely" or "very likely" that they would give in to peer pressure and go along with friends (these results not shown in Table 2). The largest proportion was for cheating on a test: twelve percent of students indicated it was likely/very likely they would do this if friends wanted them to. Approximately seven percent of students indicated that it was likely or very likely they would go along with friends if they wanted to bully another student at school or that they would drink alcohol with friends.

Differences between students of different ages[5] were found, as can be seen in Table 2. Twelve-year-olds in the sample were less likely than 14-year-olds to report that they would engage in any of the potential behaviors. Likelihood of drinking alcohol represents the greatest disparity between the two age groups, with 85 percent of 12-year-olds and only 57 percent of 14-year-olds reporting that they were "not at all likely" to engage in this behavior if their friends wanted them to. Looking at the other end of the spectrum—the proportion of students who said it was either "likely" or "very likely" they would engage in the behaviors (results not shown in table)—the largest difference between the age groups is seen for cheating on a test: one-fifth (20%) of 14-year-olds reported it was likely that they would do this if friends wanted them to, compared to just seven percent of 12-year-olds.

The results by site show that, overall, with three exceptions, the majority of youths (over 50%) in all sites indicated they would not give in to peer pressure to commit deviance. The behaviors with the biggest range across sites were cheating on a test and drinking alcohol. Greeley had the highest percentage of students (63%) who reported it was "not at all likely" that they would cheat on a test if their friends wanted them to, while Chicago had the lowest percentage of students (36%) who responded this way. As for drinking alcohol, Nashville had the highest percentage of youths (86%) who reported it was "not at all likely" that they would drink alcohol if their friends wanted them to, and again, Chicago had the lowest percentage of youths (58%) who responded this way. This is not to say, however, that Chicago youths were the least pro-social on all of the items, as Albuquerque had the smallest proportion of youths stating it was "not at all likely" they would give in to peer pressure for three of the behaviors (breaking into a home, beating up a stranger, and using illegal drugs).

[5] Throughout this report, results for 13-year-old students are not presented in the tables. The interest here is to demonstrate the differences between the youngest and oldest students in the sample.

Table 2: Peer Pressure

Item Frequencies by Age and City

Items	Full Sample %	Age 12 %	Age 14 %	ABQ %	POR %	DFW area %	GRE %	NSH %	PHL %	CHI %
Peer Pressure*										
Bully another student at school	57	63	46	51	57	62	58	63	62	46
Break into a home in your community	88	92	79	84	93	86	87	91	92	87
Beat up a stranger on the street	87	91	76	84	93	84	87	88	84	85
Cheat on a test at school	54	60	39	44	58	54	63	57	59	36
Steal something from a store	78	84	61	69	83	78	80	85	79	68
Drink alcohol	76	85	57	65	81	82	72	86	83	58
Use illegal drugs	87	92	73	76	91	89	85	92	92	82

* Percentage of students who responded "Not at all likely"

Since it is always the case that Chicago and Albuquerque had the lowest proportion of students indicating it was not likely they would give in to peer pressure, one might surmise that this is tied to the findings regarding age reported above (recall that students in three of the four Chicago schools and in two of the four Albuquerque schools were in 8th grade at the annual follow-up, while students in the other schools and sites were in 7th grade). If we look at the proportion of students who responded "likely/very likely," however, we see some deviation from the pattern: with the exception of cheating on a test, a larger proportion of Albuquerque students than others said it was likely they would engage in all the behaviors. Further, it was not the case that Chicago always ranked second; in fact, Greeley students often ranked as high as students in Chicago. In the next sections, we will continue to examine age and site differences, to see whether there are actual site differences or if any differences can be attributed to the fact that there are older students in Chicago and Albuquerque.

Commitment to Negative Peers

We assessed students' level of commitment to negative peers by asking them three questions about the likelihood that they would continue to associate with peers who were getting them into trouble at home, at school, and with police. These items are presented in the text box labeled "Negative Peer Commitment." Students were asked to select their answer on a five-point scale from "not at all likely" to "very likely."

Negative Peer Commitment

1. If your group of friends was getting you into trouble at home, how likely is it you would still hang out with them?
2. If your group of friends was getting you into trouble at school, how likely is it you would still hang out with them?
3. If your group of friends was getting you into trouble with the police, how likely is it you would still hang out with them?

Not at all likely, A little likely, Somewhat likely, Likely, Very likely

Students' responses to these questions are presented in Table 3, which shows the proportion of students who responded "not at all likely." In general, students did not report a high level of commitment to negative peers. Thirty-seven and 39 percent of students said it was not at all likely they would continue to associate with peers who were getting them into trouble at home and at school, respectively; and, 72 percent of youths would not hang out with friends who were getting them into trouble with law enforcement. Conversely, 16 percent of youths indicated that it was likely or very likely that they would hang out with peers who got them into trouble at home or at school, and eight percent reported the same for friends who got them in trouble with police (not shown in table).

The same relationship between age and giving in to peer pressure (shown in previous section) is found in Table 3. Fewer 14-year-olds than 12-year-olds reported it was "not at all likely" they would hang out with peers who get them in trouble at home, at school, and with the police, indicating perhaps the greater influence of peers as youths begin to reach mid-adolescence. The largest difference between 12-year-olds and 14-year-olds was their likelihood of hanging out with friends who get them in trouble with the police; threat of police attention is perhaps more salient for younger than older youths. This item also had the most variation across sites, with Nashville having the highest percentage (80%) of respondents who said this was "not at all likely" and Albuquerque having the lowest percentage (57%). Albuquerque students were also least likely to report they would stop hanging out with friends who get them into trouble at school, while youths in Portland were least likely to stop associating with friends who get them into trouble at home.

Table 3: Commitment to Negative Peers

Item Frequencies by Age and City

Items	Full Sample %	Age 12 %	Age 14 %	ABQ %	POR %	DFW area %	GRE %	NSH %	PHL %	CHI %
Negative Peer Commitment*										
Friends getting you into trouble at home, still hang out with them?	37	39	28	30	25	44	41	39	43	35
Friends getting you into trouble at school, still hang out with them?	39	42	29	29	32	44	43	40	47	38
Friends getting you into trouble with police, still hang out with them?	72	79	54	57	76	77	71	80	76	68

* % "Not at all likely"

The whole story is not told, however, by looking just at the "not at all likely" responses. Looking at the proportion of students who indicated commitment to negative peers by responding that it was "likely/very likely" they would still hang out with them (not shown in table), we see that the greatest proportion for home and law enforcement items was found among Albuquerque students, while for school, Greeley students comprised the greatest proportion. Greeley students also made up the second-largest proportion of those who would still hang out with friends getting them in trouble at home or with police. Thus, differences between sites are not necessarily tied to age, as there are site differences beyond the differences we would expect by age. That is, if differences were due solely to students' age, we would expect that Chicago students, followed by students in Albuquerque, would be the least likely in Table 3 to report they would stop hanging out with friends who got them in trouble and most likely to report that they would continue to hang out with them; this is not the case.

Use of Neutralizations

Students were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements tapping use of justifications for lying, stealing, and hitting behaviors (see box below). For this report, we combined the "agree" and "strongly agree" responses (hereafter referred to as "agree"), and the proportion of students reporting agreement to each statement is found in Table 4.

Use of Neutralizations

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?

Neutralizations for Lying

1. It's okay to tell a small lie if it doesn't hurt anyone.
2. It's okay to lie if it will keep your friends from getting in trouble with parents, teachers, or police.
3. It's okay to lie to someone if it will keep you out of trouble with them.

Neutralizations for Stealing

1. It's okay to steal something from someone who is rich and can easily replace it.
2. It's okay to take things from a store without paying for them since stores make so much money that it won't hurt them.
3. It's okay to steal something if that's the only way you could ever get it.

Neutralizations for Hitting

1. It's okay to beat up someone if they hit you first.
2. It's okay to beat up someone if you have to stand up for or protect your rights.
3. It's okay to beat up someone if they are threatening to hurt your friends or family.

Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree

As can be seen by looking at the results for the full sample, there are differences in youths' responses depending upon the behavior in question. Overall, students appear to have a greater "tolerance" for hitting than for lying or stealing: half of all youths agreed that beating someone up is okay if that person hit them first, more than one-half agreed that it is okay in order to protect their rights (57%), and over two-thirds (67%) agreed that beating up someone is okay to protect friends or family. A much smaller proportion (less than 12%) of youths agreed or strongly agreed that various stealing behaviors are okay, with the level of disagreement for lying behaviors falling in between the other two.

Consistent with findings presented earlier, 14-year-olds were more likely than 12-year-olds to use neutralizations for lying, stealing, and hitting. The most striking difference between the two age groups becomes clear when considering the responses to the statement, "It is okay to beat up someone if they hit you first." Forty-two percent of 12-year-olds agreed with this

statement, while 69 percent of 14-year-olds responded this way (a difference of 27%). There was also a sizable difference of 23 percent between 12- and 14-year-olds in their responses to "It is OK to tell a lie if it will keep your friends out of trouble." Although there were some relatively large differences between the 12- and 14-year-olds, the smallest differences were for the "stealing" neutralizations. In short, stealing is not only the least acceptable form of the three deviant behaviors to neutralize, but there is less variation across age for stealing than for the other two forms of behavior.

In terms of site differences, the widest variation again occurs within responses to the acceptability of beating up someone if they hit you first. Albuquerque students were the most likely to agree, while Portland youths were the least likely to agree (65% and 36%, respectively). On the whole, students in Philadelphia, Albuquerque, and Chicago were considerably more likely to use neutralizations than students in the other cities, but students in the Dallas-Fort Worth area were still more likely to use neutralizations than were Portland, Greeley, or Nashville students; and, they actually comprised the second-largest proportion of youths who agreed that it is okay to beat up someone to protect friends or family. Students in some cities, such as Portland and Nashville, also showed very low "tolerance" for certain forms of behavior. Portland students had the lowest level of agreement for all three forms of stealing and all three forms of hitting, but were more agreeable to lying, especially small lies. Conversely, Nashville students showed the lowest amount of agreement with the three forms of lying, agreement similar to Portland with forms of stealing, but much higher agreement that forms of hitting are okay. These results shown in Table 4 again call into question whether site differences can be explained by age differences between youths. It is not always the case that Chicago and Albuquerque students showed the greatest use of neutralizations, and in fact, a larger proportion of students in Philadelphia, and in the DFW-area for one item, justified the use of violence in certain situations.

Table 4: Use of Neutralizations

Item Frequencies by Age and City

Items	Full Sample %	Age 12 %	Age 14 %	ABQ %	POR %	DFW area %	GRE %	NSH %	PHL %	CHI %
Neutralizations*										
OK tell small lie	46	40	59	53	43	41	42	40	48	61
OK to lie if keep friends from getting in trouble	27	20	43	35	21	26	23	20	31	39
OK to lie if keep you out of trouble	27	21	40	35	19	27	26	18	28	40
OK to steal from rich	11	7	19	14	5	13	9	7	12	17
OK to steal from store	7	4	14	11	3	8	6	3	7	10
OK to steal if only way you could ever get it	8	4	17	11	4	8	6	4	8	13
OK to beat up someone if they hit you first	50	42	69	65	36	51	42	42	63	58
OK to beat up someone to stand up for rights	57	52	70	65	39	60	51	57	68	65
OK to beat up someone to protect friends/family	64	58	73	69	52	71	54	60	73	68

*% “Agree/Strongly agree”

Adherence to "Street Code"

The survey also included a series of questions designed to assess students' level of adherence to the "code of the street," a set of values and norms adopted by some to regulate interpersonal interaction (particularly aggression and violence) in chaotic, violent environments. These values and norms are based on goals of gaining and maintaining respect and are achieved by the exhibition of willingness to use violence in ways approved by or consistent with the informal rules governing behavior. To assess students' adoption of the street code, we asked them to indicate their level of agreement (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) with seven statements (see box titled "Street Code"). The percentage of students who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" to each statement is shown in Table 5.

Street Code

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

1. When someone disrespects you, it is important that you use physical force or aggression to teach him or her not to disrespect you.
2. If someone uses violence against you, it is important that you use violence against him or her to get even.
3. People will take advantage of you if you don't let them know how tough you are.
4. People do not respect a person who is afraid to fight physically for his or her rights.
5. Sometimes you need to threaten people in order to get them to treat you fairly.
6. It is important to show others that you cannot be intimidated.
7. People tend to respect a person who is tough and aggressive.

Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree

In contrast to the results regarding neutralizations for hitting, with which a majority of students overall agreed, for none of the street code items did a majority of students indicate agreement. The largest percentage (45%) was found for the third item, "People will take advantage of you if you don't let them know how tough you are," followed by "It is important to show others that you cannot be intimidated" (43% agreed). Less than one-quarter (23%) of all students agreed that it is important to use force to teach others not to disrespect you or that you need to threaten people in order to be treated fairly.

The differences across age in adherence to the street code follow the same pattern as the results for other anti-social norms, but the differences are relatively stable across the questions. Specifically, the percentage difference between the age groups for each question was somewhere between 14 and 20 percent, and three questions saw differences of 17 percent. The most appreciable difference in agreement (20%) is found for responses to the statement "If someone uses violence against you, it is important that you use violence against him or her to get even," with which 25 percent of 12-year-olds agreed,

but 45 percent of 14-year-olds agreed. This difference is not as large as the most disparate results in previous analyses; that is, there appears to be less variation by age in regard to the street code than in regard to other anti-social norms.

Table 5: Adherence to Street Code

Item Frequencies by Age and City

Items	Full Sample %	Age 12 %	Age 14 %	ABQ %	POR %	DFW area %	GRE %	NSH %	PHL %	CHI %
Street Code*										
When someone disrespects, important to use force to teach not to	23	18	36	25	13	24	23	18	35	29
When someone uses violence against you, important to use violence to get even	31	25	45	37	22	36	26	26	39	37
People will take advantage if not show how tough you are	45	39	55	54	28	43	38	43	61	51
People do not respect person afraid to fight physically for rights	42	37	50	47	28	43	41	34	59	45
Sometimes need to threaten to be treated fairly	23	18	32	26	15	23	20	20	36	26
Important to show others you cannot be intimidated	43	37	54	47	34	41	41	39	55	47
People respect person who is tough and aggressive	41	35	52	49	26	36	39	38	57	44

*% "Agree/Strongly agree"

Overall, Portland students showed the least agreement with street code values (see Table 5), and for the most part, the percentage who agreed is considerably lower than in any other city. Across the board, a greater percentage of students in Philadelphia than in other sites expressed agreement with the street code. This is consistent with previous results for hitting neutralizations and is notable because Philadelphia students are younger than those in Chicago and Albuquerque. Students in Albuquerque and Chicago also reported relatively high agreement, while those in Nashville and Greeley exhibited lower levels of agreement. DFW-area students again fell somewhere in between. The biggest cross-site difference is in the level of agreement with the statement, "People will take advantage of you if you do not let them know how tough

you are." Sixty-one percent of Philadelphia youths agreed with this statement, while only 28 percent of Portland youths agreed. This difference of thirty-three percent is not only the largest within "adherence to street codes," but is the largest cross-site difference in all of the anti-social norms reported.

Likelihood of Reporting Deviant Behavior

A final "anti-social" norm assessed in the youth survey was "likelihood of reporting" deviance. Students were asked to indicate on a five-point scale how likely it would be that they would report it if they saw someone engaging in a number of deviant acts (the six questions can be found in box titled "Likelihood of Reporting"). The proportion of students who stated it was "likely" or "very likely" that they would report the behaviors is presented in Table 6.

Likelihood of Reporting

How likely is it you would report it if you saw someone doing the following things?

1. Breaking into a locker at school?
2. Bullying another student at school?
3. Breaking into a home in your community?
4. Beating up a stranger on the street?
5. Cheating on a test at school?
6. Stealing something from a store?

Not at all likely, A little likely, Somewhat likely, Likely, Very likely

There is quite a range across the items in terms of students' likelihood of reporting the behaviors in question. Students were most likely to indicate that they would report someone breaking into a home in their community (54%), but only about a quarter (26%) would report someone cheating on a test at school. A little over one-third would report someone breaking into a locker (36%) or bullying another student (35%) at school. Interesting results are also found on the other end of the spectrum: fully 37 percent of students indicated that it was "not at all likely" that they would report cheating on a test (not shown in table), and one-third of students would not report the other five behaviors.

The likelihood of reporting deviant behavior varies more between 12- and 14-year-olds than did agreement with the street code and is closer to the variation seen in agreement with neutralizations. The overarching pattern between 12- and 14-year-olds is also evident in these results: 12-year-olds were always more likely than 14-year-olds to indicate that they would report someone engaging in any of these behaviors. The smallest difference (12%) between the age groups relates to reporting cheating on a test at school, but the percentage of 12-year-olds

who would report this behavior was already relatively low at 30 percent. The largest difference between the age groups concerns the reporting of someone stealing something from a store: 14-year-olds were nearly half as likely as 12-year-olds to say that they would be likely to report this (27% and 50%, respectively). Looking at the other end of the scale, it is notable (and perhaps disturbing, especially to educators) that almost half (49%) of 14-year-olds said it was "not at all likely" that they would report someone cheating on a test (results not shown in table), compared to 31 percent of 12-year-olds.

Table 6: Likelihood of Reporting

Item Frequencies by Age and City

	Full Sample	Age 12	Age 14	ABQ	POR	DFW area	GRE	NSH	PHL	CHI
Items	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Likelihood of Reporting*										
Breaking into locker at school?	36	41	25	33	47	32	45	35	27	27
Bullying another student at school?	35	40	23	29	42	32	43	38	32	25
Breaking into home in your community?	54	60	42	55	67	48	58	60	40	45
Beating up stranger in street?	49	56	35	47	64	43	57	53	37	39
Cheating on test at school?	26	30	18	19	29	26	33	29	24	18
Stealing something from store?	42	50	27	37	55	39	48	48	32	32

* % "Likely/Very likely"

For this anti-social norm, no site's youths were most likely or least likely to report for every item, although in general, a greater percentage of students in Portland, Greeley, and Nashville would be likely to report deviance. There is also a general lack of well-defined groups of behaviors for which youths from any given site showed a clear preference in the likelihood of reporting, unlike some sites' preferences for certain types of neutralizations. The biggest cross-site differences are found in the likelihood of reporting someone breaking into a home in their community and someone beating up a stranger on the street. Both are differences of 27 percent, and again, Portland youths were the most likely to report, while Philadelphia youths were the least likely. The smallest cross-site differences are found in likelihood of reporting someone

bullying another student and cheating on a test at school. Both are differences of 14 percent, and in this case, Greeley youths were the most likely to report, while Albuquerque youths were the least likely to report. Similar results are found when looking at the other end of the scale (not shown in table): a greater percentage of students in Philadelphia than in other sites responded that it was "not at all likely" they would report breaking into a locker, breaking into a home, or stealing something from a store and these students were highly represented (along with students in the DFW-area, Chicago, and Albuquerque) for the other behaviors as well. Interestingly, it is the DFW-area location that had the highest proportion (41%) of students who would not report someone beating up a stranger in the street. All of these results give more evidence that site differences are not necessarily age differences; there is something more that explains differences between the cities in anti-social norms.

Summary

This document is the second annual report to schools and communities prepared as part of the National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program. The G.R.E.A.T. program was developed in 1991, underwent a rigorous evaluation from 1995 – 2001, was substantially revised as a result of that evaluation, and the new curriculum was fully implemented in 2003. The core of the current G.R.E.A.T. program consists of 13 lessons, delivered by law enforcement officers in middle-school settings, intended to meet two main goals: 1) help youths avoid gang membership, violence, and criminal activity; and 2) help youths develop a positive relationship with law enforcement.

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is evaluating the current G.R.E.A.T. program in seven cities. Students have completed pre-test surveys (prior to implementation of the G.R.E.A.T. program), post-test surveys (shortly after completion of the G.R.E.A.T. program), and the first annual follow-up survey (one year after pre-test surveys were administered)[6]. We will continue to follow the same students, surveying them in their current school one time each year until 2010, to assess the impact that the G.R.E.A.T. program has on students' attitudes and behaviors. Program outcomes have not yet been assessed, but these will be shared in the future.

[6] With the exception of the two Chicago schools added during the 2007-08 school year; these schools will complete the first annual follow-up survey during the 2008-09 school year.

The current report provides descriptive information about some areas of interest for schools, law enforcement, and communities participating in the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. Specifically, we have focused on issues related to youths' adherence to anti-social attitudes or norms, including their likelihood of giving in to peer pressure to engage in deviance, their commitment to negative peers, their use of neutralizations for deviant behavior, their adoption of street code values, and their likelihood of reporting others' deviant behavior. On the whole, we find that most students do not hold anti-social norms, but there are some interesting deviations to the general patterns.

A majority of youths would not give in to peer pressure to engage in a variety of deviant behaviors and nearly two-fifths would not continue to associate with peers who got them in trouble at home or at school; over 70 percent would stop hanging out with friends who got them in trouble with police. Very few students agreed that it was okay to steal things; about a quarter agreed that it was okay to lie to keep friends or themselves from getting in trouble, while almost half agreed it was okay to tell a small lie. There was much greater "tolerance" for violent than for stealing or lying behaviors: over half of all students used neutralizations for hitting behavior, agreeing that it was okay to beat up someone in three different situations. It was not the case, however, that the majority of students go so far as to adopt a "street code" mentality; across the range of street code items, less than one-quarter to less than one-half of students agreed. In regard to students' likelihood of reporting deviance, about one-half of students would report deviance in their community (54% would report someone breaking into a home; 49% would report someone beating up a stranger in the street; 42% would report someone stealing from a store), but there was less apparent willingness to report deviance occurring at school: while over a third would report someone breaking into a locker (36%) or bullying (35%), only one-quarter (26%) would report cheating.

In every instance, a larger proportion of older (14-year-olds) than younger (12-year-olds) students exhibited anti-social norms. The largest age differences (25% or greater) were in giving in to peer pressure to drink alcohol, continuing to hang out with friends getting them into trouble with police, and agreeing that it is okay to hit someone if they hit you first. Smallest age differences were generally found for continuing to associate with peers getting them into trouble at home or school and for agreement with neutralizations for stealing. Since most of the older students are concentrated in two of our sample cities (in Chicago, students in three of four

schools were in eighth-grade during the 2007-08 school year, as were students in two of four schools in Albuquerque; students in all other schools and sites were in seventh-grade), one might hypothesize that students in Chicago and Albuquerque would, by virtue of being older, be more likely than students in the other sites to report anti-social norms. While this seems to be the case for peer pressure to engage in deviance, results for the other anti-social norms complicates the picture a bit. It was not, for example, Chicago and Albuquerque that had the lowest proportion of students who would stop hanging out with peers getting them into trouble at home and school (commitment to negative peers), but rather Albuquerque and Portland. For neutralizations, although Chicago and Albuquerque students were most likely to agree with lying and stealing neutralizations, Philadelphia students (and in one instance Dallas-Fort Worth area students) also scored high on hitting neutralizations. Although Philadelphia youths seem less likely than youths in many other cities to be influenced by peers (giving in to peer pressure and being committed to negative peers), there appears to be a relatively stronger influence of a "street code" mentality in Philadelphia, with a greater proportion of students in this city agreeing with neutralizations for violence (Table 4) and with statements reflective of street code values (Table 5). It is perhaps not ironic that Philadelphia is ostensibly the city in which University of Pennsylvania professor Elijah Anderson's book *The Code of the Street* was set.

Overall, most students do not adhere to anti-social norms. There is relatively greater adoption of anti-social attitudes among older than younger students, and there are often clear differences across the seven sites, with the general pattern being that students in Albuquerque, Chicago, and Philadelphia are relatively more anti-social in their attitudes than are students in Portland, Greeley, and Nashville. Some of these site differences may be due to age, but more likely, differences are due to influences from the contextual environments in which these students live. Of particular concern for teachers and school administrators may be the findings regarding school-related anti-social norms, including that only 54 percent of students said it was not likely they would cheat on a test at school if friends wanted them to (12% said was likely/very likely), that only 57 percent would not bully another student at school if friends wanted them to, and that only about one-third of students would report someone breaking into a locker, bullying another student, or cheating on a test at school.

For more information about the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program, see the official G.R.E.A.T. website located at http://www.great-online.org/ .

For more information about youth gangs and effective responses, see the official website of the National Youth Gang Center located at http://www.iir.com/nygc/ .

For more information on the earlier National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T., consult the following:

Esbensen, Finn-Aage. 2004. *Evaluating G.R.E.A.T.: A school-based gang prevention program – Research in Policy.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Available online at: http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/198604.pdf .

Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Adrienne Freng, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and D. Wayne Osgood. 2002. The National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program. Pp.139-167 in Winifred L. Reed and Scott H. Decker (Eds.), *Responding to Gangs: Evaluation and Research*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Available online at: http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/190351.pdf .

Esbensen, Finn-Aage, D. Wayne Osgood, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and Adrienne Freng. 2001. How Great is G.R.E.A.T.?: Results from a quasi-experimental design. *Criminology & Public Policy* 1 (1): 87-118.

Winfree, L. Thomas, Jr., Dana Peterson Lynskey, and James R. Maupin. 1999. Developing Local Police and Federal Law Enforcement Partnerships: G.R.E.A.T. as a case study of policy implementation. *Criminal Justice Review* 24 (2): 145-168.